

TEAM EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Recommended Guidelines



Georgia State Financing and Investment
Commission

April 2003

TEAM EVALUATION PROCESS

Contents

Instructions for Evaluation Process	2
Appendices	
Predesign Evaluation Form	4
Design Evaluation Form	6
Construction Evaluation Form	8

GUIDELINES FOR THE TEAM EVALUATION PROCESS

Goal

The principal goal of the Team Evaluation Process is to provide a formalized, quality enhancing mechanism through which the primary participants in a state design and construction project (Owner, Client Agency, Predesigner, Designer, and Contractor) can obtain periodic performance feedback and come together in regular partnering sessions. It is intended that the process be implemented on all capital improvement projects with a construction cost estimated to be greater than \$2,000,000. A secondary goal is to generate reliable performance data on project team participants to assist state Owners and Client Agencies in making optimum future selections of Architects and Contractors and in improving their own performance in helping deliver functional, economical and timely projects.

It is recommended that implementation of the process combine both “high tech” and “high touch” components. For logistical, reporting and record keeping aspects of the process, a collaboration webs site, such as www.eProject.com, should be employed. For consensus building reviews, final ratings and general partnering discussions, face to face meetings are recommended. However, it is also recognized that alternative means, such as faxing and conference calls, may be employed when judged more suitable to project circumstances and approved by the Owner Representative. Likewise, for projects of short duration, the Owner Representative may elect to eliminate one or more of the interim reviews.

Implementation

In order to facilitate and formalize the requirement for all the parties to participate in the Team Evaluation Process, all of the parties must contractually agree in advance to do so. This will occur through the agreements between the Designer and the Owner and between the Contractor and the Owner, both of which will be consented to by the Client Agency. A specific provision of these agreements is the waiver of rights for any party to sue for libel or slander in connection with results obtained and posted through the use of the described process.

Evaluations of the various Team Members should occur at appropriate intervals during the design and construction process. The evaluations should occur when sufficient information is available to determine the performance of the parties involved. The key to the success of the system, however, is that feedback be given early enough in the process to affect the outcome of the process. Consequently, evaluations should occur as follows:

1. at the completion of the Design Development Phase to determine the effectiveness of the Predesign and to give positive feedback to the Design Team;
2. upon 50% completion of the Construction Documents Phase;
3. twice during the Construction Phase (33% & 67%); and
4. at Final Project Completion.

To improve the effectiveness of the process, interim evaluations of the Design Team and the Contractor should be destroyed when the Final Project Completion evaluation has been completed.

Initial Evaluation

Upon completion of the Design Development Phase, the Owner Representative should email the Designer, the Predesigner (if different from the Designer), the Client Agency Representative and the Contractor (if selected) an invitation to join the Team Evaluation Process for the project. Also accompanying this invitation will be the evaluation form applicable to this stage of project development plus an additional invitation to a Design Development Phase Review Session.

Within ten days, each participant in the process will complete their preliminary ratings, including ratings of their own performance during this phase, and post those scores to the project evaluation web site. Within a week, all of the parties will then convene to discuss the postings. At this session, each party will discuss the preliminary ratings they have posted as well as

opportunities for performance improvements. The final activity of this session will be for the group to arrive at consensus final ratings for each party for each evaluation category, with any "deadlocks" resolved by simply averaging all the scores for that category. The Owner Representative will then post these final phase ratings on the project evaluation web site. (In the event the Predesigner was not previously contracted to participate in this evaluation, that firm may still be invited to do so, either in person or via conference call.)

Interim Evaluations

Upon 50% completion of the Construction Documents and upon 33%, and 67% of the project's construction, similar evaluation and partnering activities initiated by the Owner Representative will take place.

Final Evaluation

The final review will differ in the following respects. After the preliminary evaluation is posted, the final review session may take place as a conference call and the consensus ratings will become the final overall project ratings for each team member to be posted to the project evaluation web site. When posted, all previous ratings will be removed. These final postings will then be made generally available to other state Owners and Client Agency Representatives for use in connection with the implementation of future state projects.

APPENDIX A
EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR PREDESIGN

Instructions: Enter number for evaluated level of performance: 1 = Did not meet expectations; 2 = Met Expectations; 3 = Exceed Expectations; 4 = Far Exceeded Expectations

Indicate Team Member performing evaluation:

A = Owner; B = Client Agency; C = Predesigner; D = Design Professional; E = Constructor

	A	B	C	D	E
Does it appear that the Predesign Document represented a conscientious professional effort?					
Did the Predesign document follow the OPB/GSFIC Guidelines as amended?					
Did the Predesign Firm communicate well with the Owner's Representative?					
Did the Predesign Firm communicate well with the Client Agency's Representative?					
Was the Predesign document completed on schedule (except for Owner or Client Agency factors beyond the Predesign Firm's control)?					
Was the programming information reasonably complete (except for unforeseeable mission changes)?					
Was a design developed that conforms relatively closely to the programmed area (except for unforeseeable mission changes)?					
Was a design developed that conforms relatively closely to the concept site diagram, if applicable (except for unforeseeable mission changes)?					
Was a design developed that conforms relatively closely to the estimated construction cost (except for unforeseeable mission changes)?					
Is the current total project budget relatively close to the Predesign total project budget (adjusted for late funding, unforeseeable mission changes or site influences, if no site was initially identified)?					
Is the current project schedule relatively close to the Predesign project schedule (adjusted for late funding and unforeseeable project changes)?					
Has the Predesign Firm been cooperative and easy to work with?					
Other areas for possible improvement by the Predesign Firm on future Predesign assignments would include: (See attached)					
Did the Owner's Representative put forward a conscientious professional effort during Predesign?					
Were the Owner's requested deviations from the OPB/GSFIC Guidelines, if any, reasonable?					
Did the Owner's Representative communicate well with Predesign Firm?					
Did the Owner's Representative communicate well with the Client Agency's Representative?					
Was the information to be furnished by the Owner's Representative provided in a timely manner?					
Were the reviews or approvals to be provided by the Owner's Representative done in a timely manner?					
Was the Owner's Representative helpful to the Predesign Professional in fostering Client Agency cooperation?					
If the Owner's Representative made changes in the mission of the project during Predesign, were reasonable adjustments made to the Predesign Professional's fee and schedule?					
Based on the funding obtained, was the Owner realistic in defining the desired scope of the requested project?					
Was the Owner realistic in projecting the start of project implementation?					
Has the Owner been cooperative and easy to work with?					
Other areas for possible improvement by the Owner's Representative on future Predesign assignments would include: (See attached)					
Did the Client Agency's Representative put forward a conscientious professional effort during Predesign?					

APPENDIX A
EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR PREDESIGN

Instructions: Enter number for evaluated level of performance: 1 = Did not meet expectations;
2 = Met Expectations; 3 = Exceed Expectations; 4 = Far Exceeded Expectations

Indicate Team Member performing evaluation:

A = Owner; B = Client Agency; C = Predesigner; D = Design Professional; E = Constructor

	A	B	C	D	E
Were the Client Agency's requested deviations from the OPB/GSFIC Guidelines, if any, reasonable ?					
Did the Client Agency's Representative communicate well with Predesign Professional?					
Did the Client Agency's Representative communicate well with the Owner's Representative?					
Was the information to be furnished by the Client Agency's Representative provided in a timely manner?					
Was the Client Agency's Representative helpful in arranging programming sessions between the Predesign Firm and Client Agency staff members?					
Was the Client Agency's Representative helpful in expediting the provision of information "promised" to the Predesign Firm by Client Agency staff members?					
Were the reviews or approvals to be provided by the Client Agency's Representative done in a timely manner?					
Was the Client Agency's Representative helpful to the Predesign Firm in fostering Owner cooperation?					
If the Client Agency's Representative made changes in the mission of the project during Predesign, were reasonable adjustments to the Predesign Firm's fee and schedule supported?					
Based on the funding obtained, was the Client Agency realistic in defining the desired scope of the requested project?					
Was the Client Agency realistic in projecting the start of project implementation?					
Has the Client Agency been cooperative and easy to work with?					
Other areas for possible improvement by the Client Agency's Representative on future Predesign assignments would include: (See attached)					

APPENDIX B
EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR DESIGN

Instructions: Enter number for evaluated level of performance: 1 = Did not meet expectations; 2 = Met Expectations; 3 = Exceed Expectations; 4 = Far Exceeded Expectations

Indicate Team Member performing evaluation:

A = Owner; B = Client Agency; C = Predesigner; D = Design Professional; E = Constructor

	A	B	C	D	E
Does it appear that the Design Development Documents represent a conscientious professional effort?					
Did the Design Development Documents follow the requirements of the Statewide Construction Manual?					
Did the Designer adequately confirm the Predesign programmatic requirements?					
Did the Design Firm communicate well with the Owner's Representative?					
Did the Design Firm communicate well with the Client Agency's Representative?					
Were the Design Development Documents completed on schedule (except for Owner or Client Agency factors beyond the Design Firm's control)?					
Did the design developed reasonably adhere to the Predesign Program (except for subsequent mission changes)?					
Did the design developed conform relatively closely to the Predesign concept site diagram, if applicable (except for unforeseeable mission changes)?					
Is the current construction estimate relatively close to the Predesign construction estimate (adjusted for actual funding, unforeseeable mission changes or site influences, if no site was initially identified)?					
Is the current overall project schedule relatively close to the Predesign project schedule (except for Owner or Client Agency factors beyond the Design Firm's control)?					
Does the design developed reflect an adequate concern for constructability?					
Does the design developed reflect an adequate concern for maintainability?					
Does the design developed reflect an adequate concern for energy conservation and the environment?					
Did the Design Firm exhibit leadership in the management of his consultants?					
Was the Design Firm innovative in dealing with design issues?					
Has the Design Firm been cooperative and easy to work with?					
Other areas for possible improvement by the Design Firm on future Design Development assignments would include: (See attached)					
Did the Owner's Representative put forward a conscientious professional effort during Design Development?					
Did the Owner's Representative communicate well with the Design Firm?					
Did the Owner's Representative communicate well with the Client Agency's Representative?					
Was the information to be furnished by the Owner's Representative provided in a timely manner?					
Were reviews or approvals to be provided by the Owner's Representative done in a timely manner?					
Was the Owner's Representative helpful to the Design Firm in fostering Client Agency cooperation?					
If the Owner's Representative made changes in the mission of the project during Design Development, were reasonable adjustments made to the Design Firm's fee and schedule?					
Based on actual funding, were the Owner's expectations realistic concerning the desired scope of the project?					
Were the Owner's expectations realistic concerning the overall project schedule?					
Has the Owner been cooperative and easy to work with?					
Other areas for possible improvement by the Owner's Representative on future Design Development assignments would include: (See attached)					

APPENDIX B
EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR DESIGN

Instructions: Enter number for evaluated level of performance: 1 = Did not meet expectations;
2 = Met Expectations; 3 = Exceed Expectations; 4 = Far Exceeded Expectations

Indicate Team Member performing evaluation:

A = Owner; B = Client Agency; C = Predesigner; D = Design Professional; E = Constructor

	A	B	C	D	E
Did the Client Agency's Representative put forward a conscientious professional effort during Design Development?					
Were the Client Agency's requested deviations from the Statewide Construction Manual, if any, reasonable?					
Did the Client Agency's Representative communicate well with Design Firm?					
Did the Client Agency's Representative communicate well with the Owner's Representative?					
Was the information to be furnished by the Client Agency's Representative provided in a timely manner?					
Was the Client Agency's Representative helpful in arranging working sessions between the Design Firm and Client Agency staff members?					
Was the Client Agency's Representative helpful in expediting the provision of information "promised" to the Design Firm by Client Agency staff members?					
Were reviews or approvals to be provided by the Client Agency's Representative done in a timely manner?					
Was the Client Agency's Representative helpful to the Design Firm in fostering Owner cooperation?					
If the Client Agency's Representative made changes in the mission of the project during Design Development, was the Client Agency Representative supportive of reasonable adjustments to the Design Firm's fee and schedule?					
Based on actual funding, were the Client Agency's expectations realistic concerning the desired scope of the project?					
Were the Client Agency's expectations realistic concerning the overall project schedule?					
Has the Client Agency been cooperative and easy to work with?					
Other areas for possible improvement by the Client Agency's Representative on future Design Development assignments would include: (See attached)					

APPENDIX C
EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR CONSTRUCTION

Instructions: Enter number for evaluated level of performance: 1 = Did not meet expectations; 2 = Met Expectations; 3 = Exceed Expectations; 4 = Far Exceeded Expectations

Indicate Team Member performing evaluation:

A = Owner; B = Client Agency; C = Predesigner; D = Design Professional; E = Constructor

	A	B	C	D	E
Does it appear that the Construction Documents represent a conscientious professional effort?					
Were the Construction Documents completed on schedule (except for Owner or Client Agency factors beyond the Design Firm's control)?					
Do the Construction Documents follow the requirements of the Statewide Construction Manual?					
Has the Design Firm followed proper procedures in communicating with the other team members?					
Does the Design Firm communicate well with the Owner's Representative?					
Does the Design Firm communicate well with the Client Agency's Representative?					
Does the Design Firm communicate well with the Contractor?					
Is the current overall project schedule relatively close to the Design Firm's estimated project schedule (except for Owner or Client Agency factors beyond the Design Firm's control)?					
Does the design developed reflect an adequate concern for constructability?					
Was the project awarded at or near the original budget?					
Has the Design Firm responded promptly to RFI's?					
Has the Design Firm responded promptly to submittals?					
Has the Design Firm provided prompt and reasonable review of pay requests?					
Has there been the need for a large number of design related change orders?					
Has the Design Firm provided adequate and timely site inspections and reports?					
Has the Design Firm required his consultants to provide adequate and timely site inspections and reports?					
Have requests for post bid addenda and/or change orders been addressed in a timely manner?					
Has the Design Firm been cooperative and easy to work with?					
Other areas for possible improvement by the Design Firm for the rest of the project would include: (See attached)					
Has a reasonable and detailed project schedule been provided in a timely fashion?					
Has the work been installed in accordance with the approved project schedule as amended?					
Has a schedule for review of submittals been provided in a timely fashion?					
Have submittals been provided in accordance with the agreed upon submittal schedule?					
Has the Contractor consistently reviewed submittals for compliance to the contract documents prior to submission to the Design Firm?					
Has the project superintendent demonstrated competency in overseeing and managing the work?					
Has the project management demonstrated competency in overseeing and managing the project?					
Has the Contractor commenced with an adequate workforce?					
Have there been any complaints of nonpayment from subcontractors or suppliers?					
Has the Contractor provided adequate workspace and equipment for the REI?					
Has the job site been maintained in good order?					
Has the Contractor's safety plan resulted in few accidents at the site?					
Has the Contractor's quality control plan been effective in preventing notices of non-complying work?					

APPENDIX C
EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR CONSTRUCTION

Instructions: Enter number for evaluated level of performance: 1 = Did not meet expectations;
2 = Met Expectations; 3 = Exceed Expectations; 4 = Far Exceeded Expectations

Indicate Team Member performing evaluation:

A = Owner; B = Client Agency; C = Predesigner; D = Design Professional; E = Constructor

	A	B	C	D	E
Has the Contractor been cooperative in acknowledging and correcting non-complying work?					
Have requests for information been reasonable and timely?					
Has the Contractor been cooperative and easy to work with?					
Has the Contractor followed proper procedures in communicating with the other team members?					
Have change order requests been addressed in a timely manner?					
Has the Contractor been fair in requesting additional compensation or time?					
Has the punch list process been administered professionally by the Contractor?					
Has the close-out documentation process been administered professionally by the Contractor?					
Has the Contractor provided complete and legible as-built documents to the Design Firm in a timely manner?					
Does the Contractor communicate well with the Owner's Representative?					
Does the Contractor communicate well with the Client Agency's Representative?					
Does the Contractor communicate well with the Design Firm?					
Have change order requests been addressed in a timely manner?					
Has the Contractor been cooperative and easy to work with?					
Was the overall performance of the Contractor satisfactory?					
Other areas for possible improvement by the Contractor for the rest of the project would include: (See attached)					
Has the Owner's Representative put forward a conscientious professional effort since the completion of Design Development?					
Have payments been made in a timely manner?					
Have reviews or approvals to be provided by the Owner's Representative been done in a timely manner?					
Has the Owner's Representative provided consistent leadership for the team?					
Has the Owner's Representative followed proper procedures in communicating with the other team members?					
Does the Owner's Representative communicate well with the Design Firm?					
Does the Owner's Representative communicate well with the Client Agency's Representative?					
Does the Owner's Representative communicate well with the Contractor?					
Was the information to be furnished by the Owner's Representative provided in a timely manner?					
If the Owner's Representative made changes in the mission of the project since the last review, were reasonable adjustments made to the Design Firm's fee and schedule?					
Was the Owner's Representative helpful to the Design Firm in fostering Client Agency cooperation?					
Have requests for post bid addenda and/or change orders been addressed in a timely manner?					
Has the Owner been cooperative and easy to work with?					
Was the overall performance of the Owner satisfactory?					
Other areas for possible improvement by the Owner's Representative for the rest of the project would include: (See attached)					
Has the Client Agency's Representative put forward a conscientious professional effort since the completion of Design Development?					

APPENDIX C
EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR CONSTRUCTION

Instructions: Enter number for evaluated level of performance: 1 = Did not meet expectations;
2 = Met Expectations; 3 = Exceed Expectations; 4 = Far Exceeded Expectations

Indicate Team Member performing evaluation:

A = Owner; B = Client Agency; C = Predesigner; D = Design Professional; E = Constructor

	A	B	C	D	E
Have reviews or approvals to be provided by the Client Agency's Representative been done in a timely manner?					
Has the Client Agency's Representative followed proper procedures in communicating with the other team members?					
Does the Client Agency's Representative communicate well with the Design Firm?					
Does the Client Agency's Representative communicate well with the Owner's Representative?					
Does the Client Agency's Representative communicate well with the Contractor?					
Was the information to be furnished by the Client Agency's Representative provided in a timely manner?					
Was the Client Agency's Representative helpful to the Design Firm in fostering Client Agency cooperation?					
Have requests for post bid addenda been addressed in a timely manner?					
Has the Client Agency been proactive in accepting responsibility for the operation and maintenance of the completed facility after assuming occupancy?					
Has the Client Agency been cooperative and easy to work with?					
Was the overall performance of the Client Agency satisfactory?					
Other areas for possible improvement by the Client Agency's Representative for the rest of the project would include: (See attached)					